

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 3.

We cordially join with our cotemporary in recommending some suitable reception of the Hon. H. A. P. Carter, on his return from Washington, where he has labored with untiring zeal and industry for the Hawaiian Treaty, during the past four months. What will be the best way to give expression to the public wish, we leave for others to suggest, though it ought to be done without delay.

THE steamer's mail from San Francisco will probably announce the action of the Senate on the Treaty. If favorable, as we all hope it may be, it will not be final, as one clause in it requires that it shall be approved by the House of Representatives, before becoming operative. This will necessitate a delay in its final ratification till Congress assembles in December next; though it is probable that the exchange of signatures of the sovereign parties to it can be made during the interval, thus avoiding all further delay should the lower house sustain the Senate.

RARELY have we seen in print so bold an attempt to deceive the public, and at the same time reproduce assertions calculated to injure the planting interest as connected with the pending treaty, than appeared in the *Advertiser* of Saturday last. With the ostensible purpose of attempting to show that the editor of the *Gazette*, who was formerly editor of the *Advertiser*, is responsible for the exaggerated statements which the opponents of the treaty have lately been studiously circulating abroad, with the view of creating a feeling against the measure, it quotes a part of Mr. J. C. King's address and the contents of a California paper, which accompanied it, as though they were ours. This is a gross misrepresentation. The facts are these: When the treaty was under discussion in 1868, Mr. King arrayed himself against it, and made a speech full of unfair statements. This was printed on the fourth page of the *Advertiser*, in 1868, occupying a column of the paper, without comment from us, his status being then well known. In a note on the inside, we called attention of the reader to the address as the views of an opponent, and to Mr. George Gordon's letter, which was printed alongside it, as those of one in favor of the treaty. They were inserted to give both sides of the debate on a question of vital interest to the islands. Now the apparent object of the republication by the *P. C. A.* of a paragraph from Mr. King's address, just at this time, appears to be solely to furnish the opponents of the treaty with fresh arguments, which had been forgotten, that they might be used by the representatives in Congress, in attempts to defeat it, in the event of its having passed the Senate. A more silly and unkind thrust at this popular national measure has not been made during the present discussion—and it has all the more force because published without a line of explanation, or even the statement that its author was a bitter opponent of the measure. Had the *Advertiser* stated, when referring to it, that Mr. King's address was a tissue of falsehoods from beginning to end, strangers not knowing the man would not have been so likely to believe his statement as now reproduced. If this be not a "fire in the rear," what can it be?

THE same writer has evidently been searching his dusty volumes of the *P. C. A. Advertiser*, and finds that away back in the review of the island trade of 1865, a statement was made that there were 100,000 acres of cane land in the group, (then and now believed to be correct), which, if "under full cultivation," might produce 200 millions of pounds of sugar. This statement was distinctly given as merely a supposition of what might be produced if the whole 100,000 acres were under cultivation. Now any simpleton knows that the whole of a man's farm can never be put under cultivation at once. Of the cane land in this group not over one-half can ever be planted at one time. And of this not over twenty-five thousand acres can be cropped in one season, as cane generally takes two years to mature, which, at the highest estimate, could not be made to yield over two tons to the acre or fifty millions pounds. To do this, would require thousands of laborers and millions of capital not now here. Whatever may have been the views of writers ten or twenty years ago, the experience of the past decade clearly shows that this group cannot produce much more than it now does, twenty-five millions pounds of sugar, without a large influx of labor and capital; and that under no other circumstances can the present yield be doubled during the next seven or even ten years.

Our experience has led us to believe that impersonality in journalism is the best policy, on all accounts. This is decidedly correct. The *P. C. A.* believes that impersonality in journalism is the best policy, and in the same paper drags out in three several instances the name of the editor of the *Gazette*, who was formerly editor of the *Advertiser*—as the author of certain extracts quoted. Impersonality is a very pretty theory, at least for the *P. C. A.* to preach, but a very hard one to practice. It is also a very nice rule to adopt, for instance, when a paper wishes to open a fire in the rear, and call attention to arguments which in the hands of opponents may tell against measures of vital interest to the property if not the very life of the nation. Now the public care very little whether H. L. Sheldon, J. H. Black, J. O. Carter, or any other person, hunted up for publication the forgotten address and false assertions of that bitter opponent of Hawaiian reciprocity, J. C. King; the effect of public attention being in the time called to them will be the same—a fire in the rear, which in the event of the treaty having passed the Senate, may operate to checkmate it in the House. Is there no power in the hand to stop these insidious attacks on the only measure calculated to impart life to Hawaii, and to be a blessing to both the nations entering into the compact?

The new leader of the Liberal party in England, the Marquis of Hartington, is properly speaking a Whig; but in the changes of politics, that party has become merged with the Liberal, and he has been chosen the leader of the combination. He is very wealthy, his income amounting to over a million dollars annually. He is said to be opposed to

any present step toward the disestablishment of the Church of England; but at the same time he is not opposed to the principle as something that may become the best of policy in the future. Hartington has been acting closely with Gladstone and the Liberal party for the last eight years, and has been in office most of the time. In 1868 he held the position of Postmaster General, when Gladstone first came to the head of the Government, and served as a distinguished member or a Cabinet that contained such men as Earl Gray and Ripon, Lowe, Cardwell, Clarendon, Goschen and John Bright. He is not, however, on account of his election to the leadership, to be accepted as the equal in ability with men like Foster, Bright, Lowe, and Goschen. He was elected, probably, to conciliate and flatter the nobility.

## Our Firemen.

An exciting and very interesting friendly contest between fire engine companies No. 1 and 4 took place on Saturday afternoon last, in front of our office. Both companies turned out in full force, and the members seemed in best of spirits, and prepared to have a well-contested trial. The two engines are very similar in size and appearance, and showed that they are kept in perfect order. Five different tests were made, viz., throwing horizontal streams; two horizontal streams from each engine; perpendicular streams; trying to overflow each other, technically called "washing each other;" and attaching to hydrants. Each separate trial caused great amusement and excitement among the crowd, as the spectators favored this or that company. But throughout the contest, it was observed that No. 4's stream was much the larger, which led to a measurement of the nozzles of the pipes, when it was found that No. 1 had been using a  $\frac{3}{4}$  inch and No. 4 a  $\frac{1}{2}$  inch nozzle. This at once placed the contestants on an unequal footing, as the inch nozzle requires about one-fourth larger volume of water to supply it. Taking this into account, the contest was very even, and though No. 1 threw the farthest, No. 4 sent much the largest stream. His Majesty, who is still a member of No. 4, was present as a spectator, during the trial, and enjoyed it as much as did any of the firemen or spectators. The following is the report of the judges:

HONOLULU, March 29, 1875.

The undersigned appointed as judges and referee of the match between Engine Companies No. 1 and 4, at the trial on Saturday, March 27, beg to report: On the first trial of a horizontal stream, No. 1 threw a water a few feet in advance of No. 4, but No. 4's was the best and farthest stream. Two horizontal streams at once—No. 1 was 15 feet beyond No. 4. In throwing perpendicular stream, No. 1 threw slightly above the height reached by No. 4. In the trial as washing each other, we judge that it was about an even thing. In taking water from a hydrant, No. 1 was decidedly the quickest, having got on a stream in 40 seconds. No. 4, in each instance, threw the best stream, as to the volume of water. In fairness it should be stated that the nozzle of No. 1's boat was an 8th of an inch smaller than that of No. 4. In conclusion, we beg to say, we are of opinion that in drill of Saturday last, both companies showed themselves to be efficient, and deserving the confidence of the public.

H. L. SHELTON, for No. 1.  
D. N. FLYNNER, for No. 4.

## Hawaiian Literature.

In its last issue, our cotemporary raises its periodical line and cry about the demoralizing Hawaiian literature published here, referring in particular to a correspondence between the *Lahui Hawaii* and the *Kuokou*, touching the verdict of the jury in the Abigail Malika case, when, it will be remembered, the jury cleared her, after she had confessed her guilt. The *Lahui Hawaii* commenced the discussion some weeks since, by a justly severe article on the verdict, which, however, applied solely to the jury and did not include the law-officers, who were equally blame-worthy. Correspondents of the two papers named, then took up the discussion, and continued it for several weeks, becoming at times quite excited over it, and indulging in not very refined epithets, equivalent to "fool," "vagrabond," "bummer," etc. etc. Neither of them appears to have used immoral expressions, as charged, unless one in the last letter of the *Kuokou* writer who so termed. He calls his opponent a child of an animal, fed on the milk of contention and strife, a half-man, half-beast, and therefore unable to comprehend what he or anyone else writes. In fact, in the use of sarcastic language, as well as in the points taken in his argument, he had decidedly the advantage of his opponent, and so the discussion ended. In this state of affairs, the friends of the vanquished seek aid and comfort in the *Advertiser*, and they are welcome to all they can get there. There has nothing appeared in print which need alarm anyone or offend the most sensitive.

Now while we have our hand in this matter of Hawaiian newspapers, we will add a few words. We commenced the native paper *Kuokou*, 14 years ago, as a co-operative undertaking, a native society, called the *Ahahi Kuokou*, guaranteeing to support and circulate it, while we undertook its business management. Mr. William B. Ragsdale was its first editor. In this way the paper started, as essentially a native enterprise, and it has been so conducted ever since, Hawaiians writing its articles, setting up its types, printing, folding, distributing it, and collecting its monies. It is and has always been peculiarly a Hawaiian institution, designed originally and ever since conducted, with the one idea steadily in view of being an educator of the people, by training them to write for, print and do all the work necessary to maintain it. And in this service over two hundred natives are constantly employed as workmen, agents and carriers! In some years we have sunk from five hundred to a thousand dollars in conducting it. But what of this? We are willing to suffer loss if we can only help to educate and train Hawaiians in the newspaper service. While having the responsible management, we seldom interfere in the editing, unless we find that the writers need checking, when it is promptly done.

Now there are some who contend that the Hawaiians must only do just so—they must think, talk, read, stand, walk and sit, according to certain arbitrary rules of propriety and decorum—beyond this they must not go. While the whole field of English literature is open to foreigners, they have but two small newspapers, and some contend that into these nothing must be allowed to enter but what agrees with the Shorter Catechism or the Prayer Book. These are very well in their places, but Hawaiians need variety, and mental amusement as well as others. They enjoy good jokes, and some of their writers are adepts in ridicule, sarcasm and invective. Shall we deny them

the only literary pleasure they have, in writing for and reading their own papers? If the *Advertiser* people think so, they may possibly be the reason why they have been so unsuccessful in all their native newspaper ventures. We have acted on the contrary rule, and always allowed them some latitude in their literary efforts. Thus far our endeavors have, in the main, been well sustained, and we hope will continue to be. At all events, we know that the *Kuokou*, as at present conducted, is popular with the natives, and the best paper they have ever had, also they would not sustain it as they do.

## A Prosperous Nation.

We published a statement two weeks since that the bullion in the Bank of France amounted to over 270,000,000 dollars, drained from almost every country into the vaults of that institution. Among the late news items, we find that the subscription to the Paris city loan for fifty millions of dollars, amounted to \$2,100,000,000. In other words, two thousand, one hundred millions of dollars were offered to take up a loan of fifty millions! This indicates a degree of wealth never shown before by any people, and is certainly a most remarkable phenomenon in finance.

The explanation is given by a French writer, Bonnet, in two articles published in the *Revue des Deux Mondes*, which have been translated and published in America. Among other facts, it states that the indemnity demanded by Germany, at the close of the war in 1871, was 5,000,000,000 francs, or nearly \$1,000,000,000. Bonnet says, within two years and a half from May, 1871, this indemnity was fully paid in specie of its equivalent, and that, "without disturbing home industry and the commercial relations of the country, or seriously impairing its stock of the precious metals." There had been a suspension of specie payments, since August, 1870. The volume of paper money was increased from that date to the close of 1873, from \$251,000,000, with a specie reserve of 90 per cent, to more than \$800,000,000, with only 24 per cent of specie on hand. And yet all this time paper money was at par with gold, save an interval in the Autumn of 1871, when the highest premium on gold was but 2½ per cent.

The author goes on to state that "before the war France had in the country specie to the amount of \$1,200,000,000. The indemnity, with the interest thereon, the expenses of the army of occupation, the contributions levied by the Prussians during the war, and the ransom exacted from certain cities, amounted to fully as much as all this specie." All these obligations were promptly met in gold or its equivalent, and yet in the beginning of the fourth year after the close of the war, "the supply of specie in France is very nearly what it was in 1870!" By what magic was this thing done? Simply by the practice of industry and economy by all the people, and of wisdom by the Government. "The annual savings of the country," says Bonnet, "are \$800,000,000 a year." Foreign trade is "always in favor of a people so inventive and frugal." The average French laborer, in factory, or on farm, will live better on a franc a day than the average American or English laborer will on five francs. The gain of France from the close of 1871 to the close of 1873, in her exchanges with foreign nations, was \$100,000,000 in gold. "A second source of gain was the demands which France had upon other countries, in the form of interest in foreign loans and in the shares and obligations of industrial enterprises abroad. From the selling out of these interests and drawing home the investments, another \$200,000,000 was realized." The other \$100,000,000 needed to pay the indemnity was easily raised by foreign loans, because the country's credit is good everywhere. This \$100,000,000 was all she had to ask in the way of credit from strangers.

An American paper, commenting on this statement, says: "Those who argue in haste that because France has been able to do this marvelous feat, and place herself in a position so soon to resume specie payment, therefore the United States has only to resume upon resumption to realize it, make a great mistake. It is not the work of the French Minister, but of the French people, that they now, just after paying out \$1,200,000,000, have as much specie in the country as at the beginning of the war. The French people sell, the Americans buy. The balance of trade is in favor of the French, always against the Americans. We have a stock on hand not over \$165,000,000, all told. They have \$1,200,000,000. We have more paper money than France by \$125,000,000, and only an eighth as much specie. We have eaten our cake, the French have saved theirs. It is impossible to eat and save it too. French capital has bought up and reacquired all the bonds issued to cover the \$1,000,000,000 indemnity, so that the interest, payable in specie, is paid and used in France. The frugality of her people enabled them to do this; enabled them also, the other day, when the city of Paris asked for a loan of \$50,000,000, to subscribe to the amount of \$2,100,000,000—nearly as much in a day as the whole volume of the remaining debt of the United States."

## Eclipses in 1875.

Great preparations are being made by the English astronomers in India to observe the total eclipse of the sun, which is to take place on the 6th of April next. Their headquarters will be at Bangkok, Siam, the King of Siam having invited them to his capital, and offered to bear part of the expenses of the expedition. Many of our readers have noticed the fact that only two eclipses are predicted for this year, both of the sun, and none of the moon. This is not as rare an occurrence as some have supposed, for it takes place three times during the cycle of 18 years. For example, there were but two eclipses, both of the sun, in the years 1857, 1864 and 1868.

Although there will be no lunar eclipses this year in the strict definition of the term, yet the moon will three times enter the earth's penumbra, unheralded by the Nautical Almanac. The effect upon her light will be so slight, that the fact has not been considered worthy of mention in the almanacs. The first of these penumbral eclipses will take place in the morning of April 20th, beginning at 3h 33m 40sec. A. M., and ending at 7h 31m 30sec. A. M., Honolulu time. The magnitude of the eclipse will be 0.55, i. e., a little more than half of the moon will be immersed in the earth's penumbra. The second eclipse, if it can be called so, will take place early in the morning of September 14th, beginning at 1h 46m 52sec. A. M., and ending at 3h 1m 37sec. A. M., Honolulu time. The magnitude of this eclipse will be only about one-sixteenth, on the moon's N. E. limb. The third will come off October 14th,

but will not be visible here, as it will begin at 10h 42m 20sec. A. M., and end at 2h 20m 20sec. P. M., Honolulu time.

Encke's comet, the period of which is only 3.3 years, was looked for by astronomers during last February. It was then by calculation in the constellation Pisces, and was slowly moving eastward. It is probably not visible to the naked eye, but may yet be discovered with the telescope by some of our amateur astronomers.

In connection with the above items from our correspondent, we may add this from an American paper: "During the recent appearance of Coggia's comet, Mr. Norman Lockyer, the English astronomer, made some valuable scientific discoveries. Every night, while the comet was visible he was on his watch-tower, using the most powerful telescope in England; he mapped its march and photographed its every phase; he resolved its fan-shaped nucleus into millions of shooting meteors; and he experimented on the large number of meteorites in the British museum—meteorites that have fallen in every part of Europe—and found that when heated up to a certain point their spectroscopic signs were exactly those of the comet."—Ed.

## Railroad and Steamboat Combination.

The managers of the Union Pacific Railroad have lately obtained control of the Pacific Mail Company, by large purchases of its stock. For a year or more past there has been a fierce opposition between these rival lines, and the rates of passage and freight have in consequence ruled unusually low. Since the change in managers (about March 4) the rates have been put up, and are announced to be as follows, by railroad, for every hundred pounds:

First class merchandise is raised from \$3 25 to \$5 per 100 lbs.; second class, from \$2 to \$1; third class, from \$1 50 to \$3; fourth class, from \$1 50 to \$2 50; class A, from \$1 70 to \$2 25; class B, from \$1 60 to \$2; class C, from \$1 50 to \$1 75; class D, from \$1 40 to \$1 50.

By the Panama steamers, the rates for every 100 pounds of freight have been advanced to: For first class to \$4 50; second class to \$3 50; third class to \$2 50; fourth class to \$2 25; class A to \$2; class B to \$1 75; class C to \$1 50; class D to \$1 20. These steamer rates are nearly double what the old were. In addition to these freight changes, there will hereafter be but one steamer a month, despatched to China, instead of two as formerly.

The *Alta's* New York correspondent says of the changes: "The advance on the second-class of freight, which includes dry goods, is 100 per cent, and affects a very large trade. Still the Railroad men claim it will be well received among heavy shippers, for the reason that they somewhat cripple merchants of small capital. Rufus Hatch, who is still managing director of the Pacific Mail, says plainly that 'Since the Government has robbed the country of four and a-half million, we feel justified in getting our money back. Let the people pay for it.' There will soon be an advance in passenger rates, and to what extent is not known."

The *Bulletin* remarks: "It will be seen that the tariff has been advanced from 25 to 60 per cent, all round. Importers will hereafter have to pay an average of 50 per cent, more to get their goods here than before. The advance will stiffen the value of stocks usually imported by the short routes, and consumers will have to foot the bill."

These changes apply to all goods destined for these islands, and consequently make the inland American cost very heavy, varying, from \$60 to \$100 a ton on ordinary merchandise.

## The Close of Congress.

The following is the telegraphic report of Speaker Blaine's closing address in the House of Representatives:

GENTLEMEN: I close with this House a six-year's service as Speaker of the House of Representatives, a period expressed in length by but two of any predecessors and equalled by only two others. The rapid mutations of personal and political fortune in this country have limited the great majority of those who occupied this chair to short terms of office. It would be the gravest insensibility to the honors and responsibilities of life not to be deeply touched by so signal a mark of public esteem as that which I have three received at the hands of my political associates. I desire, on this last moment, to renew to them, one and all, my thanks and gratitude. To those from whom I differ in my party relations, the minority of this House, I tender my acknowledgments for the generous courtesy with which they have treated me. By one of those sudden and decisive changes which distinguish popular institutions, and which conspicuously mark a free people, that minority is transferred in the ensuing Congress to the governing power of the House. However it might possibly have been under other circumstances, that event necessarily renders this my farewell to the Chair. The Speakership of the American House of Representatives is a post of honor, of dignity, of power, of responsibility. Its duties are at once simple and complex, are both vexatious and delicate. They are performed in the broad light of day, under the eyes of the whole people, subject at all times to the closest observation, and always subjected to the sharpest criticism. I think no other official is held to such constant and rigid accountability. Parliamentary rules in their very nature are peremptory, almost absolute in authority, and instantaneous in effect. They cannot always be enforced in such a way as to win the applause of all, but I am sure that no man of any party who is worthy to sit in this chair will ever shrink from the broad light of day, under the eyes of the whole people, subject at all times to the closest observation, and always subjected to the sharpest criticism. I think no other official is held to such constant and rigid accountability. Parliamentary rules in their very nature are peremptory, almost absolute in authority, and instantaneous in effect. They cannot always be enforced in such a way as to win the applause of all, but I am sure that no man of any party who is worthy to sit in this chair will ever shrink from the broad light of day, under the eyes of the whole people, subject at all times to the closest observation, and always subjected to the sharpest criticism. I think no other official is held to such constant and rigid accountability. Parliamentary rules in their very nature are peremptory, almost absolute in authority, and instantaneous in effect. They cannot always be enforced in such a way as to win the applause of all, but I am sure that no man of any party who is worthy to sit in this chair will ever shrink from the broad light of day, under the eyes of the whole people, subject at all times to the closest observation, and always subjected to the sharpest criticism. I think no other official is held to such constant and rigid accountability. Parliamentary rules in their very nature are peremptory, almost absolute in authority, and instantaneous in effect. They cannot always be enforced in such a way as to win the applause of all, but I am sure that no man of any party who is worthy to sit in this chair will ever shrink from the broad light of day, under the eyes of the whole people, subject at all times to the closest observation, and always subjected to the sharpest criticism. I think no other official is held to such constant and rigid accountability. Parliamentary rules in their very nature are peremptory, almost absolute in authority, and instantaneous in effect. They cannot always be enforced in such a way as to win the applause of all, but I am sure that no man of any party who is worthy to sit in this chair will ever shrink from the broad light of day, under the eyes of the whole people, subject at all times to the closest observation, and always subjected to the sharpest criticism. I think no other official is held to such constant and rigid accountability. Parliamentary rules in their very nature are peremptory, almost absolute in authority, and instantaneous in effect. They cannot always be enforced in such a way as to win the applause of all, but I am sure that no man of any party who is worthy to sit in this chair will ever shrink from the broad light of day, under the eyes of the whole people, subject at all times to the closest observation, and always subjected to the sharpest criticism. I think no other official is held to such constant and rigid accountability. Parliamentary rules in their very nature are peremptory, almost absolute in authority, and instantaneous in effect. They cannot always be enforced in such a way as to win the applause of all, but I am sure that no man of any party who is worthy to sit in this chair will ever shrink from the broad light of day, under the eyes of the whole people, subject at all times to the closest observation, and always subjected to the sharpest criticism. I think no other official is held to such constant and rigid accountability. Parliamentary rules in their very nature are peremptory, almost absolute in authority, and instantaneous in effect. They cannot always be enforced in such a way as to win the applause of all, but I am sure that no man of any party who is worthy to sit in this chair will ever shrink from the broad light of day, under the eyes of the whole people, subject at all times to the closest observation, and always subjected to the sharpest criticism. I think no other official is held to such constant and rigid accountability. Parliamentary rules in their very nature are peremptory, almost absolute in authority, and instantaneous in effect. They cannot always be enforced in such a way as to win the applause of all, but I am sure that no man of any party who is worthy to sit in this chair will ever shrink from the broad light of day, under the eyes of the whole people, subject at all times to the closest observation, and always subjected to the sharpest criticism. I think no other official is held to such constant and rigid accountability. Parliamentary rules in their very nature are peremptory, almost absolute in authority, and instantaneous in effect. They cannot always be enforced in such a way as to win the applause of all, but I am sure that no man of any party who is worthy to sit in this chair will ever shrink from the broad light of day, under the eyes of the whole people, subject at all times to the closest observation, and always subjected to the sharpest criticism. I think no other official is held to such constant and rigid accountability. Parliamentary rules in their very nature are peremptory, almost absolute in authority, and instantaneous in effect. They cannot always be enforced in such a way as to win the applause of all, but I am sure that no man of any party who is worthy to sit in this chair will ever shrink from the broad light of day, under the eyes of the whole people, subject at all times to the closest observation, and always subjected to the sharpest criticism. I think no other official is held to such constant and rigid accountability. Parliamentary rules in their very nature are peremptory, almost absolute in authority, and instantaneous in effect. They cannot always be enforced in such a way as to win the applause of all, but I am sure that no man of any party who is worthy to sit in this chair will ever shrink from the broad light of day, under the eyes of the whole people, subject at all times to the closest observation, and always subjected to the sharpest criticism. I think no other official is held to such constant and rigid accountability. Parliamentary rules in their very nature are peremptory, almost absolute in authority, and instantaneous in effect. They cannot always be enforced in such a way as to win the applause of all, but I am sure that no man of any party who is worthy to sit in this chair will ever shrink from the broad light of day, under the eyes of the whole people, subject at all times to the closest observation, and always subjected to the sharpest criticism. I think no other official is held to such constant and rigid accountability. Parliamentary rules in their very nature are peremptory, almost absolute in authority, and instantaneous in effect. They cannot always be enforced in such a way as to win the applause of all, but I am sure that no man of any party who is worthy to sit in this chair will ever shrink from the broad light of day, under the eyes of the whole people, subject at all times to the closest observation, and always subjected to the sharpest criticism. I think no other official is held to such constant and rigid accountability. Parliamentary rules in their very nature are peremptory, almost absolute in authority, and instantaneous in effect. They cannot always be enforced in such a way as to win the applause of all, but I am sure that no man of any party who is worthy to sit in this chair will ever shrink from the broad light of day, under the eyes of the whole people, subject at all times to the closest observation, and always subjected to the sharpest criticism. I think no other official is held to such constant and rigid accountability. Parliamentary rules in their very nature are peremptory, almost absolute in authority, and instantaneous in effect. They cannot always be enforced in such a way as to win the applause of all, but I am sure that no man of any party who is worthy to sit in this chair will ever shrink from the broad light of day, under the eyes of the whole people, subject at all times to the closest observation, and always subjected to the sharpest criticism. I think no other official is held to such constant and rigid accountability. Parliamentary rules in their very nature are peremptory, almost absolute in authority, and instantaneous in effect. They cannot always be enforced in such a way as to win the applause of all, but I am sure that no man of any party who is worthy to sit in this chair will ever shrink from the broad light of day, under the eyes of the whole people, subject at all times to the closest observation, and always subjected to the sharpest criticism. I think no other official is held to such constant and rigid accountability. Parliamentary rules in their very nature are peremptory, almost absolute in authority, and instantaneous in effect. They cannot always be enforced in such a way as to win the applause of all, but I am sure that no man of any party who is worthy to sit in this chair will ever shrink from the broad light of day, under the eyes of the whole people, subject at all times to the closest observation, and always subjected to the sharpest criticism. I think no other official is held to such constant and rigid accountability. Parliamentary rules in their very nature are peremptory, almost absolute in authority, and instantaneous in effect. They cannot always be enforced in such a way as to win the applause of all, but I am sure that no man of any party who is worthy to sit in this chair will ever shrink from the broad light of day, under the eyes of the whole people, subject at all times to the closest observation, and always subjected to the sharpest criticism. I think no other official is held to such constant and rigid accountability. Parliamentary rules in their very nature are peremptory, almost absolute in authority, and instantaneous in effect. They cannot always be enforced in such a way as to win the applause of all, but I am sure that no man of any party who is worthy to sit in this chair will ever shrink from the broad light of day, under the eyes of the whole people, subject at all times to the closest observation, and always subjected to the sharpest criticism. I think no other official is held to such constant and rigid accountability. Parliamentary rules in their very nature are peremptory, almost absolute in authority, and instantaneous in effect. They cannot always be enforced in such a way as to win the applause of all, but I am sure that no man of any party who is worthy to sit in this chair will ever shrink from the broad light of day, under the eyes of the whole people, subject at all times to the closest observation, and always subjected to the sharpest criticism. I think no other official is held to such constant and rigid accountability. Parliamentary rules in their very nature are peremptory, almost absolute in authority, and instantaneous in effect. They cannot always be enforced in such a way as to win the applause of all, but I am sure that no man of any party who is worthy to sit in this chair will ever shrink from the broad light of day, under the eyes of the whole people, subject at all times to the closest observation, and always subjected to the sharpest criticism. I think no other official is held to such constant and rigid accountability. Parliamentary rules in their very nature are peremptory, almost absolute in authority, and instantaneous in effect. They cannot always be enforced in such a way as to win the applause of all, but I am sure that no man of any party who is worthy to sit in this chair will ever shrink from the broad light of day, under the eyes of the whole people, subject at all times to the closest observation, and always subjected to the sharpest criticism. I think no other official is held to such constant and rigid accountability. Parliamentary rules in their very nature are peremptory, almost absolute in authority, and instantaneous in effect. They cannot always be enforced in such a way as to win the applause of all, but I am sure that no man of any party who is worthy to sit in this chair will ever shrink from the broad light of day, under the eyes of the whole people, subject at all times to the closest observation, and always subjected to the sharpest criticism. I think no other official is held to such constant and rigid accountability. Parliamentary rules in their very nature are peremptory, almost absolute in authority, and instantaneous in effect. They cannot always be enforced in such a way as to win the applause of all, but I am sure that no man of any party who is worthy to sit in this chair will ever shrink from the broad light of day, under the eyes of the whole people, subject at all times to the closest observation, and always subjected to the sharpest criticism. I think no other official is held to such constant and rigid accountability. Parliamentary rules in their very nature are peremptory, almost absolute in authority, and instantaneous in effect. They cannot always be enforced in such a way as to win the applause of all, but I am sure that no man of any party who is worthy to sit in this chair will ever shrink from the broad light of day, under the eyes of the whole people, subject at all times to the closest observation, and always subjected to the sharpest criticism. I think no other official is held to such constant and rigid accountability. Parliamentary rules in their very nature are peremptory, almost absolute in authority, and instantaneous in effect. They cannot always be enforced in such a way as to win the applause of all, but I am sure that no man of any party who is worthy to sit in this chair will ever shrink from the broad light of day, under the eyes of the whole people, subject at all times to the closest observation, and always subjected to the sharpest criticism. I think no other official is held to such constant and rigid accountability. Parliamentary rules in their very nature are peremptory, almost absolute in authority, and instantaneous in effect. They cannot always be enforced in such a way as to win the applause of all, but I am sure that no man of any party who is worthy to sit in this chair will ever shrink from the broad light of day, under the eyes of the whole people, subject at all times to the closest observation, and always subjected to the sharpest criticism. I think no other official is held to such constant and rigid accountability. Parliamentary rules in their very nature are peremptory, almost absolute in authority, and instantaneous in effect. They cannot always be enforced in such a way as to win the applause of all, but I am sure that no man of any party who is worthy to sit in this chair will ever shrink from the broad light of day, under the eyes of the whole people, subject at all times to the closest observation, and always subjected to the sharpest criticism. I think no other official is held to such constant and rigid accountability. Parliamentary rules in their very nature are peremptory, almost absolute in authority, and instantaneous in effect. They cannot always be enforced in such a way as to win the applause of all, but I am sure that no man of any party who is worthy to sit in this chair will ever shrink from the broad light of day, under the eyes of the whole people, subject at all times to the closest observation, and always subjected to the sharpest criticism. I think no other official is held to such constant and rigid accountability. Parliamentary rules in their very nature are peremptory, almost absolute in authority, and instantaneous in effect. They cannot always be enforced in such a way as to win the applause of all, but I am sure that no man of any party who is worthy to sit in this chair will ever shrink from the broad light of day, under the eyes of the whole people, subject at all times to the closest observation, and always subjected to the sharpest criticism. I think no other official is held to such constant and rigid accountability. Parliamentary rules in their very nature are peremptory, almost absolute in authority, and instantaneous in effect. They cannot always be enforced in such a way as to win the applause of all, but I am sure that no man of any party who is worthy to sit in this chair will ever shrink from the broad light of day, under the eyes of the whole people, subject at all times to the closest observation, and always subjected to the sharpest criticism. I think no other official is held to such constant and rigid accountability. Parliamentary rules in their very nature are peremptory, almost absolute in authority, and instantaneous in effect. They cannot always be enforced in such a way as to win the applause of all, but I am sure that no man of any party who is worthy to sit in this chair will ever shrink from the broad light of day, under the eyes of the whole people, subject at all times to the closest observation, and always subjected to the sharpest criticism. I think no other official is held to such constant and rigid accountability. Parliamentary rules in their very nature are peremptory, almost absolute in authority, and instantaneous in effect. They cannot always be enforced in such a way as to win the applause of all, but I am sure that no man of any party who is worthy to sit in this chair will ever shrink from the broad light of day, under the eyes of the whole people, subject at all times to the closest observation, and always subjected to the sharpest criticism. I think no other official is held to such constant and rigid accountability. Parliamentary rules in their very nature are peremptory, almost absolute in authority, and instantaneous in effect. They cannot always be enforced in such a way as to win the applause of all, but I am sure that no man of any party who is worthy to sit in this chair will ever shrink from the broad light of day, under the eyes of the whole people, subject at all times to the closest observation, and always subjected to the sharpest criticism. I think no other official is held to such constant and rigid accountability. Parliamentary rules in their very nature are peremptory, almost absolute in authority, and instantaneous in effect. They cannot always be enforced in such a way as to win the applause of all, but I am sure that no man of any party who is worthy to sit in this chair will ever shrink from the broad light of day, under the eyes of the whole people, subject at all times to the closest observation, and always subjected to the sharpest criticism. I think no other official is held to such constant and rigid accountability. Parliamentary rules in their very nature are peremptory, almost absolute in authority, and instantaneous in effect. They cannot always be enforced in such a way as to win the applause of all, but I am sure that no man of any party who is worthy to sit in this chair will ever shrink from the broad light of day, under the eyes of the whole people, subject at all times to the closest observation, and always subjected to the sharpest criticism. I think no other official is held to such constant and rigid accountability. Parliamentary rules in their very nature are peremptory, almost absolute in authority, and instantaneous in effect. They cannot always be enforced in such a way as to win the applause of all, but I am sure that no man of any party who is worthy to sit in this chair will ever shrink from the broad light of day, under the eyes of the whole people, subject at all times to the closest observation, and always subjected to the sharpest criticism. I think no other official is held to such constant and rigid accountability. Parliamentary rules in their very nature are peremptory, almost absolute in authority, and instantaneous in effect. They cannot always be enforced in such a way as to win the applause of all, but I am sure that no man of any party who is worthy to sit in this chair will ever shrink from the broad light of day, under the eyes of the whole people, subject at all times to the closest observation, and always subjected to the sharpest criticism. I think no other official is held to such constant and rigid accountability. Parliamentary rules in their very nature are peremptory, almost absolute in authority, and instantaneous in effect. They cannot always be enforced in such a way as to win the applause of all, but I am sure that no man of any party who is worthy to sit in this chair will ever shrink from the broad light of day, under the eyes of the whole people, subject at all times to the closest observation, and always subjected to the sharpest criticism. I think no other official is held to such constant and rigid accountability. Parliamentary rules in their very nature are peremptory, almost absolute in authority, and instantaneous in effect. They cannot always be enforced in such a way as to win the applause of all, but I am sure that no man of any party who is worthy to sit in this chair will ever shrink from the broad light of day, under the eyes of the whole people, subject at all times to the closest observation, and always subjected to the sharpest criticism. I think no other official is held to such constant and rigid accountability. Parliamentary rules in their very nature are peremptory, almost absolute in authority, and instantaneous in effect. They cannot always be enforced in such a way as to win the applause of all, but I am sure that no man of any party who is worthy to sit in this chair will ever shrink from the broad light of day, under the eyes of the whole people, subject at all times to the closest observation, and always subjected to the sharpest criticism. I think no other official is held to such constant and rigid accountability. Parliamentary rules in their very nature are peremptory, almost absolute in authority, and instantaneous in effect. They cannot always be enforced in such a way as to win the applause of all, but I am sure that no man of any party who is worthy to sit in this chair will ever shrink from the broad light of day, under the eyes of the whole people, subject at all times to the closest observation, and always subjected to the sharpest criticism. I think no other official is held to such constant and rigid accountability. Parliamentary rules in their very nature are peremptory, almost absolute in authority, and instantaneous in effect. They cannot always be enforced in such a way as to win the applause of all, but I am sure that no man of any party who is worthy to sit in this chair will ever shrink from the broad light of day, under the eyes of the whole people, subject at all times to the closest observation, and always subjected to the sharpest criticism. I think no other official is held to such constant and rigid accountability. Parliamentary rules in their very nature are peremptory, almost absolute in authority, and instantaneous in effect. They cannot always be enforced in such a way as to win the applause of all, but I am sure that no man of any party who is worthy to sit in this chair will ever shrink from the broad light of day, under the eyes of the whole people, subject at all times to the closest observation, and always subjected to the sharpest criticism. I think no other official is held to such constant and rigid accountability. Parliamentary rules in their very nature are peremptory, almost absolute in authority, and instantaneous in effect. They cannot always be enforced in such a way as to win the applause of all, but I am sure that no man of any party who is worthy to sit in this chair will ever shrink from the broad light of day, under the eyes of the whole people, subject at all times to the closest observation, and always subjected to the sharpest criticism. I think no other official is held to such constant and rigid accountability. Parliamentary rules in their very nature are peremptory, almost absolute